1	SCOTT N. SCHOOLS (SCBN 9990) United States Attorney	
2 3	MARK L. KROTOSKI (CABN 138549) Chief, Criminal Division	
4	JULIE A. ARBUCKLE (CABN 193425) Assistant United States Attorneys	
5 6 7	450 Golden Gate Avenue, Box 36055 San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone: (415) 436-7102 Facsimile: (415) 436-7234 E-mail: julie.arbuckle@usdoj.gov	
8 9	Attorneys for the United States of America	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
12	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) CR No. 07-0207 MMC
14	Plaintiff,) STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER EXCLUDING TIME
15	v.) ORDER EXCLUDING TIME)
16	VERNON WHITE,	
17	Defendant.	
18)
19		
20		
21	On April 10, 2007, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time	
22	should be excluded from the calculations under the Speedy Trial Act from April 10, 2007 to	
23	April 18, 2007 for effective preparation of counsel. The parties represented that there is good	
24	cause for granting the continuance, and that it was the reasonable time necessary for effective	
25	preparation of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. §	
26	3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a	
27	continuance outweighed the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. <u>See</u>	
28	18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).	
	1	

SO STIPULATED: 1 2 SCOTT N. SCHOOLS United States Attorney 3 4 DATED: April 11, 2007 JULIE A. ARBUCKLE 5 Assistant United States Attorney 6 DATED: April 11, 2007 STEVEN KALAR 7 Attorney for Defendant Vernon White 8 9 10 As the Court found on April 10, 2007, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the 11 defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the calculations under the 12 Speedy Trial Act from April 10, 2007 to April 18, 2007 for good cause and the effective 13 preparation of counsel. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested 14 continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation, taking into 15 account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. 16 17 §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). 18 SO ORDERED. 19 20 IT IS SO ORDERED DATED: April 16, 2007 21 Elizal 22 United Judge Elizabeth D. Laporte 23 24 25 26 27

28